



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/640,785	08/18/00	BROMLEY	W 1957.0010000

EXAMINER
----------

BROADHEAD, B	PAPER NUMBER
ART UNIT	

3661  
DATE MAILED:

10/04/01

PMB2/1004  
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, PLLC  
C/O ANNA M. SHILH, ESQ.  
39533 WOODWARD AVENUE, SUITE 140  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS MI 48304

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/640,785

Applicant(s)

BROMLEY ETAL.

Examiner

Brian J. Broadhead

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed 3-1-01 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the data bus" in line 4 and 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the need" in line 20. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the data bus" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
6. Claim 3 recites the limitation "said onboard" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed that "said onboard" was

Art Unit: 3661

meant to be --said onboard unit-- and that is what has been assumed for examination purposes.

7. Claims 5, 7, and 11 recite the limitation "the Bluetooth wireless communication". Bluetooth is a trademark and trademarks indicate the source of a product not the actual product. Since the product can be changed over time the claim is indefinite.

8. Claim 6 recites the limitation "said vehicle" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the need" in line 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 8 recites several industry standards. The use of industry standards renders the claim indefinite because standards change over time.

11. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected for being dependent on an indefinite claim.

12. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

13. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. A description of what intellect data bus (IDB) is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) and is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). It is believed that "intellect data bus" is a term coined by the applicant and without a description of what this term is representing, the claim is indefinite.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following rejections are based upon the examiners best interpretations of the claims considering the above rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle, 5815071, in view of Hapka, 5619412.

17. As per claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 12, Doyle discloses an onboard unit coupled to the data bus of the one or more vehicles (38); an application server which provides the user with a graphical user interface in order to send and receive data from each of the one or more vehicles(18); a repository database, accessible via the application server, which stored information related to the one or more vehicles on lines 55-56, on column 5; an onboard unit server, couple to the application server, which contains means to convert data between a format understandable by the user, and a format understandable by the onboard unit coupled to the data bus of the one or more vehicles lines 20-35, on column 6; a communication means, couple to the onboard unit server, for handling communications between the onboard unit server and the onboard units on the one or more vehicles (22); and the system allows fleet logistic by remote parameter changes, health tracking, and maintenance needs on lines 37-62, on column 2; receiving an acknowledgement from the onboard unit on lines 62-64, on column 3. Doyle does not

Art Unit: 3661

disclose using a GUI, a CPU, and user I/O channel ports for receiving communication from the user, and using a second application program interface based on the SAE J1708 standard. Hapka teaches of using a personal computer which has a GUI on lines 60-67, on column 4; and using the J1708 standard on line 47, on column 7. Personal computers inherently have a CPU and I/O channel ports for receiving communication from the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the personal computer and the J1708 bus of Hapka in the invention of Doyle because such modification would provide for a inexpensive central control station since personal computers are common and would remove the need to build a specialized computer system and also because the J1708 bus is a standard and allow the system to work with systems manufactured by several different vendors.

18. As per claim 2, Doyle discloses the vehicles include heavy trucks in figure 1.

19. As per claim 3, it is inherent that the format understandable by the onboard unit is binary. These are digital electronic systems and binary is the system used for digital computing.

20. As per claims 5, 7, and 11, Doyle discloses using satellite communications on line 29, on column 4.

21. Claims 4, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle, 5815071, in view of Hapka, 5619412, as applied to claim 4 and 9 above, and further in view of Apsell et al., 6292724.

Art Unit: 3661

22. Doyle and Hapka disclose all the limitations as set forth above. Doyle and Hapka do not disclose at least a first portion of the communication means includes the global internet. Apsell et al. teaches of using the internet in the communication means on lines 58, on column 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the internet in the communication means because the internet provides an inexpensive communication means.

### ***Conclusion***

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

24. Gilhousen et al., 4979170, discloses an alternating sequential half duplex communication system.

25. Lang et al., 6295492, discloses a system for transmitting and displaying multiple, motor vehicle information.

26. Asano et al., 5157610, discloses a system and method of load sharing control for automobile.

27. Fraker et al., 5919239, discloses a position and time-at- position logging system.

28. Smith et al., 5931877, discloses an advanced maintenance system for aircraft and military weapons.

29. Colson et al., 6181994, discloses a method and system for vehicle initiated delivery of advanced diagnostics based on the determined need by vehicle.

Art Unit: 3661

30. Keeler et al., 5682317, discloses a virtual emissions monitor for automobile and associated control system.

31. Skorupski et al., 5680328, discloses a computer assisted driver vehicle inspection reporting system.

32. Murphy, 6225890, discloses a vehicle use control.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Broadhead whose telephone number is 703-308-9033. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William A. Cuchlinski can be reached on 703-308-3873. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

BJB  
October 1, 2001

*Jacques H. Louis-Jacques*  
JACQUES H. LOUIS-JACQUES  
PRIMARY EXAMINER